

REMARKS

Specification and Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because Figures 1 and 2 are not labeled "prior art." Applicant has amended Figures 1 and 2 so that they now recited "prior art." Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

The Examiner also objected to the Abstract because it states "a method is provided." Applicant has amended the sentence to state that a method of testing a DUT is provided. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the abstract.

The Examiner noted that Paragraph [0014] of the specification refers in the first line to "DUT 100," but that the drawings refer to the DUT as "200." Applicant has amended Paragraph [0014] to be in accordance with the drawings.

The Examiner noted that on Page 1, Paragraph [0002], line 6, that the word "that" is missing. Applicant has amended Paragraph [0002] in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-8 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a) for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has made numerous amendments to the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to the claims under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a).

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Larson, et al. This includes independent claim 1. Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Larson.

Larson discloses the loading of a memory resource for a processor core. Non-local memory resources are accessed through a link control mechanism. See the Abstract, Figure 2, column 2, lines 50-60; column 5, lines 26-32; and column 6, lines 16-19. An external path is provided for test signals during execution of the functional test program. See the abstract, Figures 4, column 2, lines 54-60; column 5, lines 27-30; and lines 39-41.

What should be noted is that the external path described in Larson does not loop the test signals from the link control mechanism back to the link control mechanism. Claim 1 now specifically includes this as a limitation. Claim 1 thus includes at least one limitation that is not suggested by Larson. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 7, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Larson.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson in view of Rajsuman, et al. These claims depend from claim

1, and should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner objected to claims 2-4 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant has cancelled claim 1, and the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated in substance into claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Stephen M. De Klerk at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Date: May 10, 2005

Stephen M. De Klerk
Reg. No. 46,503

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicant submits substitute Sheet Nos. 1 and 2 containing Figures 1 and 2 and reflecting corrections made to Figures 1 and 2.